arXiv:1603.03243v2 [astro-ph.CO] 2 Nov 2016

Extrasolar planets as a probe of modified gravity

Marcelo Vargas dos Santos[1,2] and David F. Mota[2]

[1]*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro C. P. 68528, CEP 21941-972, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil*
[2]*Institute of Theoretical Astrophysics, University of Oslo, Postboks 1029, 0315 Oslo, Norway*

We propose a new method to test modified gravity theories, taking advantage of the available data on extrasolar planets. We computed the deviations from the Kepler third law and use that to constrain gravity theories beyond General Relativity. We investigate gravity models which incorporate three screening mechanisms: the Chameleon, the Symmetron and the Vainshtein. We find that data from exoplanets orbits are very sensitive to the screening mechanisms putting strong constraints in the parameter space for the Chameleon and Symmetron models, complementary and competitive to other methods, like interferometers and solar system. With the constraints on Vainshtein we are able to work beyond the hypothesis that the crossover scale is of the same order of magnitude than the Hubble radius $r_c \sim H_0^{-1}$, which makes the screening work automatically, testing how strong this hypothesis is and the viability of other scales.

Introduction. Gravity theories beyond General Relativity (GR) are a possible theoretical framework to explain several cosmological problems. In particular, the intriguing present day's cosmic accelerated expansion. Theoretical models which predict an extension to General Relativity must, however, comply with strong requirements: first of all the model must have similar predictions to those of the benchmark model ΛCDM at cosmological scales: observational data from both the background evolution and the linear large scale structure formation regime is fully consistent with ΛCDM. Another condition is that the modifications to General Relativity must be suppressed in the regimes which are well tested, e.g. solar system scales. This requirement is assured via the so called screening mechanisms.

In this Letter we investigate the possibility of using exoplanet data to test and constrain modified gravity models. This is not the first attempt to constrain modified gravity with exoplanets [1], but in there the authors just compared the theoretical prediction with only one measurement, the transiting exoplanet HD209458b "Osiris". This lacks statistical rigor, and in this work, we use more than one hundred data points and propose a statistical method to make a thorough treatment and study of these systems. The data are obtained from `exoplanets.org` portal [2].

The method. For any gravitational theory the planetary motion is described by the dynamics of a particle under the influence of a central force, i.e. the spatial dependence of the force is only on the distance of the planet to the force center, inside the host star. The relation between the revolution period, T, of a planet in a circular orbit, of radius r, and the absolute value of the gravitational force, $F(r)$, is given by [3]

$$T^2 = \frac{4\pi^2 r}{F(r)}\left(\frac{1}{M_\star}+\frac{1}{M_\mathrm{p}}\right)^{-1}, \tag{1}$$

where M_p and $M_\star$ are the masses of the planet and the star respectively. For a modified gravity the total force is the sum between the Newtonian force and a fifth force, $F(r) = F_N(r) + F_{5th}(r)$. If the fifth force is null this relation reduces to the third Kepler law

$$T_K^2 = \frac{4\pi^2 r^3}{G(M_\mathrm{p}+M_\star)}. \tag{2}$$

where $G = 6.67384\times10^{-8}\mathrm{cm^3 g^{-1} s^{-2}}$ is the Newton gravitational constant. So the deviation of the square period from the third Kepler law is

$$\left(\frac{T_K}{T}\right)^2 - 1 = \frac{F_{5th}}{F_N} = \varepsilon. \tag{3}$$

Therefore, we can use the measured values of ε to constrain modified gravity using a χ^2 given by the sum between the weighted residuals of all the N measurements

$$\chi^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\varepsilon_{th}(\phi(\mathbf{x}_i,\boldsymbol{\theta})) - \varepsilon_{obs,i}}{\sigma_i}\right)^2, \tag{4}$$

where ε_{th} is the theoretical prediction for ε (the ratio between the fifth and Newtonian forces predicted by theory), ε_{obs} is the observed value of ε (the deviation of the square period from the third Kepler law computed from the data), and σ_i is the standard deviation (computed from the data by error propagation, the theoretical error can be neglected because it is proportional to ε^2.). $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is a vector of model parameters and $\mathbf{x}$ is a vector of the physical properties of the star-planet system, which are: r - the planet orbit radius, $R_\star$ - the star radius, $\rho_\star$ - the star density, Φ_S - the surface Newtonian potential. The field is also a function of the galaxy density, $\rho_g = 10^{-24} g/cm^3$.

To compute the credible regions with 95% of confidence level (C.L.), we find the values of χ^2 which delimit the bounds (χ^2_b), i.e. the value which gives

$$P(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{N/2}\prod_i^N \sigma^i}\int_{\Delta\chi^2<\Delta\chi^2_b} \mathrm{e}^{-\Delta\chi^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})/2} d\boldsymbol{\theta} = 0.95, \tag{5}$$

where $\Delta\chi^2 = \chi^2 - \chi^2_{\mathrm{min}}$, and χ^2_{min} is the minimum value of χ^2. Fig. 1 (top) shows a comparison between the residuals distribution with a normal distribution of the same mean and standard deviation, which suggests that this is a good approximation for the data distribution. Therefore assuming this distribution to solve (5) we find $\Delta\chi^2_b \simeq 5.99$ and $\Delta\chi^2_b \simeq 8.08$ for models with 2 and 3 free parameters, respectively [4].



FIG. 1. Top: The residual distribution of ε_{obs} compared with a normal distribution with the same mean and standard deviation. Bottom: ε_{obs} with error bars in function of the semi major axis. However the values are very close to 0 ($\sim 10^{-5}$) the errors are much larger ($\sim 10^{-1}$), which permits a the existence of a fifth force.

The values of $\chi^2_{\rm min}$ can me found minimizing the function (4), but this is not a single point for the tested models, there is a degeneracy between the parameters. To avoid this problem we assume $\chi^2_{\rm min}$ equal to the value of χ^2 for which the fifth force is null, i.e. $\varepsilon_{th} \equiv 0$, this assumption does not change the results. For a constant deviation, for example, we find $\varepsilon = (0.0^{+6.0}_{-6.0})\times 10^{-3}$ with this assumption and $\varepsilon = (-0.1^{+6.1}_{-5.9})\times 10^{-3}$ without it. A shift less than 1% of the confidence interval, and it is reduced in the cases with screening.

The data. Our observational data comes from the website `exoplanets.org` [2], which has a compilation of all observed exoplanetary systems: there are 2926 planets with well defined orbits. From those we pick for our analysis 177 planets with circular orbits and with measurements of all properties listed above. These systems are typically composed by a star, similar to the Sun, with a mass that varies from $0.5M_\odot$ to $1.5M_\odot$, and planets like the jovian planets, with masses between $3.2M_\oplus$ and $600M_\oplus$ and typically close to the host star, with orbit radius smaller than 0.5AU. This corresponds to short periods, less than a few months.

All the properties are measured by gravity-independent methods, except the orbit radius which use the third Kepler law [5]. However this looks like a circularity it does not affect considerably our analysis, any appreciable deviation in orbit radius such would already have been measured in the Solar System. The Cassini mission [6] measured, by light time delay, the possible deviation from Newtonian gravitational constant in Solar System and the obtained value is very short

$$\frac{\Delta G}{G} = \frac{\gamma - 1}{2} \lesssim 10^{-5}, \quad (0.68\%\ \text{C.L.}). \tag{6}$$

It implies in a correction of the same order in the orbit radius, which is much smaller than σ_i. Fig. 1 (bottom) shows that the deviations from the third Kepler law ($\varepsilon_{obs} \sim 10^{-5}$) are very smaller than the errors ($\sigma \sim 10^{-1}$), suppressing any possible bias. In summary the possibility to measure deviations from Newtonian gravity is not in the measurements *per se* but with their errors. Relativistic corrections are less than 10^{-8}.

Modified gravity models. In planetary scales we are interested in the correction to the two-body potential energy to find the correction to the third Kepler law. For a complete description of these spherical solutions see [7, 8]. Here we only show the theoretical prediction for the ratio between the fifth force and the Newtonian force, which is needed for our method as mentioned above.

(a) Yukawa potential. In gravitation, this potential appears when there is a massive propagator for gravitation or a scalar-field coupled to the matter fields, for example. The action of this kind of theory is

$$S = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left\{\frac{M_{\rm pl}^2}{2}R - \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\phi)^2 - V(\phi)\right\} + S_m(\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}, \Psi), \tag{7}$$

where $M_{\rm pl} = (8\pi G)^{-1/2}$ is the reduced Planck mass, ϕ is the scalar field, $V(\phi)$ is the potential, S_m is the matter action, $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = A^2(\phi)g_{\mu\nu}$ is the Jordan frame metric, $A(\phi)$ is the conformal factor and Ψ represents the matter fields. From that we find that the potential of fifth force is $\Phi_{5th} = \ln A(\phi) = 2\beta^2\Phi_N e^{-r/\lambda}$, where Φ_N is the Newtonian potential, β is the coupling and λ is the range of the fifth force, which is related to the mass of the field by $\lambda = \hbar/mc$. In general, even β and λ are functions that depend on the parameters of the theory, and can suppress the fifth force in specific conditions. When that happens we say that the model has a screening mechanism. We begin by testing the case which β and λ are constants, i.e. it has no physical mechanism to suppress the fifth force, in this case we have

$$\varepsilon = 2\beta^2\left(1 + \frac{r}{\lambda}\right)e^{-r/\lambda}. \tag{8}$$

This model has two free parameters: β, λ.



FIG. 2. Constraints of the unscreened Yukawa potential in (λ, $\alpha = 2\beta^2$) parameter space, the blue region is ruled out by 95% of confidence level (95% C.L.). The GR is recovered when $\beta \to 0$ or $\lambda \to 0$.



FIG. 3. Left: Constraints of the Chameleon model (blue) in (n, M) parameter space (The value of Λ is fixed equal to $2.4meV$). Compared to other experiments: From bottom to top: Torsion pendulum experiment [9] (orange); atom interferometer (green) experiment [10]; Neutron interferometer [11] (above the orange line); Neutron gravity resonance [12] (above the orange line), all filed regions are ruled out by 95% C.L. The GR is recovered when $M \to \infty$.
Right: Constraints of Symmetron; the blue region is the ruled out region for $\lambda_0 \gtrsim 1$AU, the green and orange dasehd lines are the bounds for smaller values of λ_0, are ruled out by 95% C.L. Red line indicates the approximate bounds from the Cassini mission [13]. The two curves in the right side are the values ruled out by the torsion pendulum experiment in [14]. The GR is recovered when $\lambda \to \infty$ or $\mu^2 M^2 \to \rho_g$.

(b) Chameleon. This screening mechanism occurs when the field is coupled to matter in such way that the effective range of the field, λ, depends on the local matter density [15, 16]: when the density is low, the range is large and the fifth force acts at large scales; when density is high, the range is short, so the fifth force is screened.

As an example, we choose a field coupled to the matter via the conformal factor $A(\phi) \simeq 1 + \phi/M$, therefore

$$\varepsilon = \frac{1}{M}\left(\frac{\bar{\phi}_\star - \bar{\phi}_g}{\Phi_S}\right)\left(1 + \frac{r}{\lambda}\right)e^{-(r-R)/\lambda}, \tag{9}$$

where $\bar{\phi}_\star = \bar{\phi}(\rho_\star)$ and $\bar{\phi}_g = \bar{\phi}(\rho_g)$ are the values of the field which minimizes the effective potential $V_{eff}(\rho, \phi) = V(\phi) + \rho\phi/M$, inside the star and in the galactic medium, and the mass of the field is given by $m_\phi^2 = V_{,\phi\phi}(\bar{\phi}_g)$.

Choosing a Ratra-Peebles potential, $V(\phi) = \Lambda^{n+4}/\phi^n$ we have

$$\lambda^2 = \frac{\bar{\phi}_g^{n+2}}{n(n+1)\Lambda^{n+4}}, \qquad \bar{\phi}(\rho) = \left(\frac{nM}{\rho}\Lambda^{n+4}\right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}. \tag{10}$$

This model has the following free parameters: Λ, M, n.

(d) Symmetron. The Symmetron is a matter-coupled scalar field which effectively decouples from matter in high-density regions through a symmetry restoration. This is done by introducing a potential on the symmetry breaking form [7, 14]

$$V_{eff}(\varphi) = V_0 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\rho}{M^2} - \mu^2\right)\varphi^2 + \frac{1}{4}\lambda\varphi^4, \tag{11}$$

and a quadratic conformal factor, $A(\varphi) = 1 + \varphi^2/2M^2$. From the spherical solution we get

$$\varepsilon = \frac{\phi_g^2}{\Phi_S M^2}\left(1 - \frac{R_\star}{r}e^{-r/\lambda_0}\right)\left(1 + \frac{r}{\lambda_0}\right)e^{-r/\lambda_0}, \tag{12}$$

where

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\mu}, \qquad \phi_g^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda}\left(\frac{\rho_g}{M^2} - \mu^2\right). \tag{13}$$

This model has the following free parameters: μ, M, λ.

(e) Vainshtein Screening. This mechanism appears when the Lagrangian of the field involves second order derivatives of the field, $\mathcal{L} \sim \Box\phi$. These terms are, for instance, present in the DGP and Galileon models [17, 18]. Modified gravity theories with this type of screening mechanism are able to evade the stringent local gravity constraints in the solar-system, depending on the magnitude of the cross-over scale r_c. For this kind of theories we have [19]

$$\varepsilon = \frac{2}{3\beta}\left(\frac{r}{r_V}\right)^3\left[\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{r_V}{r}\right)^3} - 1\right] \tag{14}$$

where r_V is the Vainshtein radius given by

$$r_V = \left(\frac{16\Phi_S R_\star r_c^2}{9\beta^2}\right)^{1/3}. \tag{15}$$

The free parameters in these models are: r_c and β.

Results. The fig. 2 shows the ruled out region for Yukawa potential in $(\lambda, \alpha = 2\beta^2)$ parameter space. Our constraints are weaker than the ones obtained when using data from the solar system[20]. In there the authors found an upper-bound for the coupling constant of $\alpha \leq 3.1 \times 10^{-11}$ and $\alpha \leq 5.2 \times 10^{-11}$ for $\lambda = 0.15$AU and $\lambda = 0.21$AU respectively. While here we find $\alpha \leq 1.5 \times 10^{-2}$ and $\alpha \leq 1.4 \times 10^{-2}$ in 95% (C.L.) for the same values of λ respectively. The reason for our weaker bounds is due to the fact that there are much more, and better, data of orbits around the Sun than the exoplanets data. The consequence is that their constraints are about nine orders of



FIG. 4. Constraints of Vainshtein screening, the blue region is ruled out by 95% C.L. The GR is recovered when $\beta \to 0$ or $r_c \to \infty$.

magnitude better than ours. This difficulty will be softened only by increasing the number of exoplanets, since the error decreases with the number of observations, $\sigma \sim 1/\sqrt{N}$. However other models, with screening, can be better constrained because the fifth force strength depends strongly on the environment physical properties.

The results for the Chameleon inverse power law are displayed in fig. 3 (left), the filled regions are ruled out in 95% C.L. We also include bounds from other experiments [9–12]. Here Λ was fixed equal to 2.4meV to reproduce a background evolution close to ΛCDM. As one can see, the exoplanets data complements the other data sets very well: while the interferometers gives a good lower-bound on M, the exoplanets gives a very good lower-bound to the Ratra-Peeble index n. The strongest results come from the intersection of the exoplanets with the atom interferometer, where we find the lowest allowed value $n \approx 2.5$.

Fig. 3 (right) shows the results for Symmetron. For this models the screening is automatically satisfied, if one chooses μ and M such as $\phi_g^2 = 0$, however we explore cases which deviate from this choices. The blue region is the ruled out region for $\lambda_0 \gtrsim 1$AU, the green and orange dasehd lines are the bounds for smaller values of λ_0. The red line represents the approximated bounds for the Sun surface, data from the Cassini Satelite [6], given by the relation $A(\phi_g) - 1 \lesssim 5\times10^{-4}\Phi_\odot$ [13] for $\lambda_0 = 1$AU, where $\Phi_\odot \simeq 2\times10^{-6}$ is the surface gravitational potential of the Sun. Notice that our results are more restrictive, probing the power of the method especially because the field is now proportional to the square root of the deviation, i.e. $\phi_g \propto \sqrt{\varepsilon}$. We also include the bounds from a torsion pendulum experiment [14] for comparison. The torsion pendulum gives an upper-bound for M, while the exoplanets gives us a lower-bound.

For the Vainshtein screening mechanism we allow r_c and β to be free parameters. The lower-bound for β is larger as r_c is bigger as shown in fig. 4. For $r_c \sim 1$AU (planetary orbits), β must be higher than 10, in atom scale ($r_c \sim 1$fm) it reduces to 1.7×10^{-20} and to 2.5×10^{-39} for Planck scale ($r_c \sim \ell_{\rm pl}$). The choice of a very large values for β or r_c ($\beta > 10$ or $r_c > 4 \times 10^4$AU, which includes cosmological scales $r_c \sim H_0^{-1}$) is enough to make the screening works in planetary scales, suppressing any modifications to General Relativity.

Conclusions and perspectives. In this Letter we show a promising, novel and complementary method to constrain modified gravity using extrasolar planets data. Using the orbits of exoplanets we are able to put tighter constraints on the Chameleon Ratra-Peebles model and the Symmetron models. These bounds are comparable and competitive with the ones from other experiments, because exoplanets systems have a wide range of masses for the host star, resulting in different screening scales and effectiveness. For Vainshtein screening we find a relation between the free parameters (β, r_c) beyond the trivial choice $r_c \sim H_0^{-1}$.

MVS acknowledges the Brazilian agency FAPERJ and Sophie Harris-Edmond for useful suggestions. DFM acknowledges the Research Council of Norway.

This research has made use of the Exoplanet Orbit Database and the Exoplanet Data Explorer at `exoplanets.org`.

[1] L. Iorio and M. L. Ruggiero, Open Astron. J. **3**, 167 (2010).
[2] E. Han, S. X. Wang, J. T. Wright, Y. K. Feng, M. Zhao, O. Fakhouri, J. I. Brown, and C. Hancock, Astronomical Society of the Pacific **126**, 827 (2014).
[3] E. Poisson and C. M. Will, *Gravity: Newtonian, Post-Newtonian, Relativistic*, 1st ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2014) Chap. 3, pp. 140–148.
[4] P. Gregory, *Bayesian Logical Data Analysis for the Physical Sciences: A Comparative Approach with Mathematica® Support*, 1st ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2005) Chap. 10, pp. 260–264.
[5] J. T. W. A. W. Howard, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **182**, 205 (2009).
[6] B. Bertotti, L. Iess, and P. Tortora, Nature **425**, 374 (2003).
[7] K. Hinterbichler and J. Khoury, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 231301 (2010).
[8] J. Khoury, (2013), arXiv:1312.2006 [astro-ph.CO].
[9] A. Upadhye, Phys. Rev. **D86**, 102003 (2012).
[10] P. Hamilton, M. Jaffe, P. Haslinger, Q. Simmons, H. Müller, and J. Khoury, Science **349**, 849 (2015).
[11] K. Li *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 062001 (2016).
[12] T. Jenke *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 151105 (2014), arXiv:1404.4099 [gr-qc].
[13] P. Brax, A.-C. Davis, B. Li, and H. A. Winther, Phys. Rev. **D86**, 044015 (2012).
[14] A. Upadhye, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 031301 (2013).
[15] J. Khoury and A. Weltman, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 044026 (2004).
[16] J. Khoury, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 214004 (2013).
[17] G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze, and M. Porrati, Phys. Lett. **B485**, 208 (2000).
[18] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi, and E. Trincherini, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 064036 (2009).
[19] A. Barreira, S. Bose, and B. Li, JCAP **1512**, 059 (2015).
[20] Z.-W. Li, S.-F. Yuan, C. Lu, and Y. Xie, Res. Astron. Astrophys. **14**, 139 (2014).